	New Mexico - (Clayton Field Office)						
	FY 2006 RANKING CRITERIA WORKSHEET - RANGELAND						
Select One:	Range Improvements	Brush Managemen	ıt	Both			
Applicant:			Address _				
Phone	Farm # _	Tract # _		CMS Field #s	Date		
Tribal Land	Non-Tribal Land	_	Prelimina	ary Rating	Final Rating		

A minimum of 50 poits must be garnished in ordered to be considered for funding

1. Condition - (Total Maximum Points 60)										
Note: Instructions on separate sheet		% Area in Contrac Treatmen		% Area in Contract After Treatment.		t After	Potential Points	Points - Bench Mark	Points - After	
Rangelands:	lands: SI of 76-1 00 w/trend up or not apparent		%	+	_ + _	_ =	%	60		
Ecological	SI of 51-75 with upward trend		%	+	_ + _	_ =	%	50		
Site	SI of 51-75 with downward trend		%	+	_ + _	_ =	%	40		
Similarity	SI of 26-50 with upward trend		%	+ _	+	_=	%	30		
Index	SI of 26-50 with downward trend		%	+ _	+	_ =	%	20		
(SI)*	SI)* SI of 0-25 with upward trend		%	+ _	+	_ =	%	10		
	SI of 0-25 with downward trend		%	+ _	+	_ =	%	0		
Riparian:		% Quality Bench Mark:	%	% Qualit	y After: —		%	60		
Grazed Forest:	Use Attachment 4	% Quality Bench Mark:	%	% Qualit	y After: —		%	60		
	·							Total:		

2. Conservation Practices - (Total Maximum Points 280)				
Any practice used in the ranking criteria and intended to be included in the EQIP Contract must be a cost-shared practice or have an incentive payment. Higher priority (value) should be given to those practices which address multiple resource concerns, are cost effective, and have longer life spans.	Potential Points	Percent of Need to be Installed	Points - After	
Soil (Erosion), Water (Quality, Quantity), Air (N/A), Plants (Health), Animals (Habitat)				
Resource Concerns 1) Soil- Erosion, both Sheet and Rill, both Wind and Water, 2) Water- Quality and Quanity, 3) Plants- Includes Community, Productivity, Health and Vigor, as well as Invasive Plants, 4) Animals- Inadequate Forage Quanities as well as Qualities, Inadequate Stock Water as well as inadequate forage accessabilites.				
<u>Soil (Addendum)</u>				
Critical Area Planting (342) Diversion (362) Grade Stabilization Structure (410)	10 10 10			
Water (Range Improvement) Pond (378)	20			
Spring Development (574)	20			
opining Bovolopinionic (c). Ty				
<u>Air</u>	0			
Plant (Brush Management)				
Brush Management (314)	20			
Fence (382)	20			
Range Planting (550)	20			
Animal (Range Improvement)				
Animal Trail Walkway (575)	20			
Pipeline (516)	20			
Pumping Plant (533)	20			
Troughs (614) Wells (642)	20			
vveiis (042)	20	1		

	Brush Management			
Level of infestation	% Area Needing Treatment	% Area to be Treated in Contract	Potential Points	Points - After
Light	g		20	
Medium			40	
Heavy			60	
Extra Heavy			80	
Note: Multiply % Area N	eeding Treatment by % Area Treated in Contract b	y Points to get After for each Level of infestation		
		2. Conservation Practice Selection	Total:	

3. Other Considerations - (Total Maximum Poir Below are some suggested, not required, criteria. If there are other criteria the D.C. wants to	Potential Potential	Points -
recommend based on LWG advice, please include them here.	Points	After
A. At risk species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.	5	
B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.	5	
C. Treatment of this land could enhance the benefits of an active sec. 319 project.	N/A	
D. This land is within a proposed sec. 319 project.	N/A	
E. Proposed contract area will be treated to eradicate and/or prevent infestation of Class A and/or Class B noxious weeds, as designated by NMDA.	5	
F. The complete grazing operating unit is in the contract.	5	
3. Other Considerations	Total:	
Grand Total:		
Designated Conservationist Date		